

<http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-page12366707>



## The International Socialist

Journal of Revolutionary Socialism and Industrial Unionism.

Owned and controlled by the International Socialists.

Subscription: Australia, 4s per year, 1s per quarter. Postage added to other countries.

H. E. HOLLAND, Editor.  
O. W. JORGENSEN, Manager.

Office: 115 GOULBURN STREET, SYDNEY.

**A Blue Mark** through this paragraph indicates that YOUR SUBSCRIPTION WILL EXPIRE WITH NEXT ISSUE.

**A Red Mark** indicates that your Subscription must be renewed AT ONCE, if you desire the delivery of the paper to continue.

The social problem of the future we consider to be how to unite the greatest liberty of action with a common ownership in the raw materials of the globe, and an equal participation of all benefits of combined labor.—HOLL.

## The Cost Of Living.

There is a general outcry against the increasing cost of living. The workers of all countries are suffering, no matter what their fiscal systems are, or what form of government rules. Protectionist countries, like America, France, Germany, New Zealand, and Australia, are not exempt from the rise in prices any more than is freetrade Britain. Under Labour government, as under Liberal or Tory government, prices are tending upward, and so far no political party has discovered a satisfactory remedy. True, the Labour party of Australia claims that trusts and combines are the cause of prices going up, and Federal Attorney-General Hughes says there are no less than thirty-three of these combines operating in the Commonwealth. The Federal Labour Party proposes to so alter the Constitution that Parliament will be able to limit the power of monopoly either by nationalisation or restrictive legislation.

In the States, several parliaments are engrossed with the subject, though opposed to the Federal Parliament's proposals for dealing with trusts and combines. In Queensland, Mr. Adamson, Member for Rockhampton, recently moved—That it is desirable, in the interests of the people, that the government should institute an inquiry into the increased cost of living in this State." In moving his motion Mr. Adamson gave a list of 28 articles in common use which have steadily risen from 1904 to 1912. The list appears to have been carefully prepared, and is supported by statements made by witnesses in various arbitration courts throughout Australia.

Australia has enjoyed an exceptional run of prosperous seasons. Productive power has increased enormously, yet in spite of a plethora of produce prices keep going up instead of coming down. The more produce there is, the dearer it becomes, while wage-earners vainly endeavour to raise wages—the price of their commodity—labour power.

In New Zealand a Commission is inquiring into the rise in prices. In America Taft and Roosevelt are promising searching inquiries into the same thing, while in France and Germany, where prices have recently advanced 36 and 35 per cent. respectively, inquiry is keen as to the cause of increase.

In England, according to a paper presented to the House of Commons, which contained various estimates, there has been a steady rise in prices since 1895. The Board of Trade takes the prices of 1900 as the standard—100, and give the comparative price in 1895 as 91.0, or 9 per cent. below that of 1900, and as 109.3 in 1911, or 9.3 per cent. above: a rise in the sixteen years of 18 per cent.

From the above it appears safe to conclude that the rise in prices is general and fairly uniform irrespective of fiscal policies, and as there has been no corresponding rise in wages, it seems clear that there must be some universal cause ruling in all countries. As we have seen, the policies and forms of government do not seem to make much difference. Neither do the ways of production, which are as various as is the productiveness of the soil, the variety of climate, or the price of labour. There must be, then, some powerful factor apart from these which affect prices and cause a universal rise.

Turning to economists we do not find much light, until we come to Marx, who says:

"In the 16th century the gold and silver in circulation in Europe was augmented in consequence of the discovery of America. The value of gold and silver fell, therefore, in proportion to other commodities. The labourers received for their labour the same amount of silver coin as before. The money price of their labour remained the same, and yet their wages had fallen, for in exchange for the same sum of silver they obtained a smaller quantity of other commodities. This was one of the circumstances which furthered the increase of capital and the rise of the bourgeoisie in the 16th century."

This augmentation of gold and silver in the 16th century, according to Marx, caused

the value of gold and silver to fall in proportion to other commodities, and in view of the fact that from 1886 to 1910 the production of gold has rapidly increased, something like what happened in the 16th century in Europe is happening to-day. This seems the more likely when it is remembered that gold is the universal standard by which the price of all commodities are measured. Every government has adopted the gold standard, and any augmentation or reduction of the quantity of gold must affect all and be world-wide in its effects.

But while gold is the price of all other commodities, the price of gold itself is reckoned in other commodities.

"In the winter of 1847," says Marx, "in consequence of the failure of the crops, there was an important increase in the price of the indispensable means of subsistence, corn, meat, butter, cheese, and so on. We will suppose that the labourers still received the same sum of money for their labour as before. Had not their wages fallen? Of course they had. For the same amount of money, they received in exchange less bread, meat, etc., and their wages had fallen, not because the value of silver had diminished, but because the value of the means of subsistence had increased."

A rise in prices was here brought about by a failure of the crops, and as in the preceding case, in which the augmentation in the quantity of gold and silver led to a rise in prices, the labourers suffered a reduction in their wages.

"Let us finally suppose," says Marx, "that the money price of labour remains the same, while in consequence of the employment of new machinery, or on account of a good season, or for some similar reason, there is a fall in the price of all agricultural and manufactured goods. For the same amount of money the labourers can now buy more commodities of all kinds. Their wages have therefore risen, just because their money price has not changed."

There has been no universal failure of crops; and there have been good seasons and the invention and employment of new machinery, with resulting increased production, yet there has been no fall in the price of agricultural and manufactured goods and no rise in wages. Instead, there has been a steady rise in prices. The first reason adduced by Marx, namely the augmentation of the gold supply would seem, then to be a principal cause of the rise in prices of commodities measured by gold.

If we look at the world's production of gold, we see that it has more than trebled in the last twenty years—30.7 millions sterling in 1890, and 92.3 millions in 1910. A table given by Mr. Chiozza Money is only slightly less striking, extending, as it does, over a longer period. Taking the last sixteen years, his figures show that in that time the output of gold has more than doubled. He gives the value as £25,000,000 in 1890, £41,000,000 in 1895, £52,000,000 in 1900, and £97,000,000 in 1911.

This is a marvellous increase, surely, and the result fully bears out Marx's contention that a universal rise in prices can only be explained by one of two ways. Either there must be a falling-off in the production of the necessities of life, and a consequent increase in their value, or there has been an increased production and a consequent fall in the value of the universal equivalent—gold.

Since the general rise in prices cannot be said to be a result of a falling-off in the production of the necessities of life, and since it appears indisputable that there has been a great increase in gold production while prices have been rising, it seems safe to conclude that the output of gold is a principal cause of the rise in prices. And a rise in prices means a fall in wages—an attack on the industrial classes by their exploiters. To quote Marx again:

"What then, is the general law which determines the rise and fall of wages and profit in their reciprocal relation? They stand in inverse proportion to one another."

The rise in profit is exactly measured by the fall in wages, and the fall in profit by the rise in wages."

This being so, rising prices and falling wages mean a rich harvest to the profit-hunting class, and the representatives of that class appear to recognise the fact. When Harriman and Morgan determined to control the American Railways they didn't study railway management or engineering. They knew that the simplest and surest way of controlling them was to control their finances—their credit, so they went to the credit-mongers of the Stock Exchange and controlled the railways from Wall St., New York. There are no factories in Wall St., New York, yet there are no industries in America which are not affected by the Wall St. dealers in credit and money. Sir William Holden, Chairman of the London City and Midland Banking Co., says: "Gold controls the Trade of the World," and he knew what he was talking about. He knew the immense advantages the ownership of gold gives.

The class which owns and controls the production of gold is able to control the production of all other commodities, is able to force prices up and wages down, is able to convert the press, the pulpit, and parliament into mere machines for the resistance of every attempt to raise wages. It denies the right of the workers to strike for increased

wages, and passes Arbitration Acts and establishes Wages Boards as alternatives that suit it better. While Arbitration acts and Wages Boards are invented to keep the workers from raising their wages, the masters of the world attack them and lower them through increased prices.

## "Invasion And Conscription."

The above is the title of a book by James Anson Farrar. The book purports to be "Some Letters from a mere Civilian to a famous General," and is published by T. Fisher Unwin, London. The book is a thunderbolt to the Conscriptionists, and will help to turn their present defeat into an absolute rout.

The first letter is a reply to a General who is an old school fellow. The General has suggested that "the shoemaker" should stick to his last," and that such a question as the invasion of Britain by a foreign power or its prevention is a soldier's question and that the author is disinterested by his profound ignorance of military affairs to form or express any judgment of the least value. The author says in reply to this:

"You contend that this is a soldier's question, and only a soldier's question."

"Here, then, the difference between us begins. Of strategy and tactics I must confess, indeed, with sorrow to a knowledge which is hardly elementary: nor in my idle moments have I ever been able to read the story of a battle patiently to the end."

After thus pricking the "bubble-reputation" built on battle fields "even in the cannon's mouth" and belittling the soldier's glory:

"Hollow more, than the drum beaten at the Sultan's door."

Farrar proceeds to deal trenchantly with the covert attack upon civil liberty and Parliamentary government:

"The fighting of men with one another interests me as little as the fighting with one another of wolves or crows, and I hope the world will some day outgrow this animal tendency. But I cannot admit that this debars me from the right to have an opinion on the questions at issue: for in the last resort it is only the opinion of us civilians which really counts. You soldiers are within your right, of course, in stating your apprehensions of danger, and in proffering your counsel for averting such danger: but it rests with multitudes of civilians like myself to weigh these apprehensions and to judge of your proposals for their removal."

That is the condition under which we live here and now in England, nor can anything change it but the establishment of a military autocracy which should settle all questions of our military organisation by a stroke of the pen, as is done in many countries of the Continent, which are not so much political States as fortuitous aggregations of armed populations.

You soldiers, therefore, must patiently bear with our opinions, ignorant though you may think them: nor must you press too far your claim to the authority of experts. We do not dream of disputing your decision as to how the war is to be waged or the battle fought: but we claim the decision as to whether the war shall be waged at all, and as to how many men and how much money shall go to waging it. If you wish, as I gather, to make conscription the law of the land, you must convince people like myself that by no other way can we escape invasion."

I should hesitate to remind you that a question like the organisation of our forces on a compulsory or voluntary basis rests with our statesmen and not with our generals, were it not for the growing assumption in so many quarters that the only valid authority in such a question is that of the chief officers of our Army and Navy. For above and behind Parliament there now hover, in the same sort of nebulous sanctity that used to enshroud the gods of Olympus, two mighty but unseen powers: to wit, the Imperial Defence Committee and the Army Council, both recent offspring of the early twentieth century.

These new bodies may be inevitable in the political evolution of the British Empire. But, if I may say so without fear of the Tower, I cannot help wondering how they are going to co-exist permanently, or even for long, with Parliamentary government. The Prime Minister, indeed, is the Chairman of the Imperial Defence Committee, nor is he its only political member; but in a body whose function it is to advise the Cabinet on the all-important matters of Imperial defence, it hardly seems likely antecedently that the military and naval element in the Committee will not tend to overrule the political element, and come ultimately to dictate both to the Cabinet and to Parliament. I hope I may be wrong, but already we hear of frequent secret deputations to this body of a Committee headed by Lord Roberts, with the object of proving the insufficiency of the Navy to protect us from invasion, and the necessity, therefore, of a largely increased Army (*United Service Magazine*, May, 1908, p. 153): an evident attempt by the military clique to settle behind the back of Parliament a matter which belongs solely to the jurisdiction of Parliament. So long as peace lasts this tendency may be concealed: but, come a war, and the Committee of

Defence passes readily into a military despotism and the Empire, as in logic bound, transfers its homage from a King to an Emperor.

And is not the Army Council bound also to develop inevitably along the same lines? for it consists of four military members to three civilian members, of whom one is the Secretary of State for War, the President of the Council. Of its four military members, the Adjutant-General is concerned with the raising and organising of our military forces, and it is difficult to see how his possible personal preference for a compulsory system of service would fail to impose itself on his colleagues, and through their authority be enforced upon Parliament. These conditions may be necessary for the future needs of the Empire; all I am contending for it that the creation of these two bodies is a nail in the coffin of Parliament, inasmuch as they tend to make the "Services" its masters.

You will doubtless laugh at these fears of mine as old-fashioned. But I only mention them in illustration of my argument that it is possible to press too far the principle of the supreme value of professional or expert opinion. And even if I were to accept that principle to the degree you claim for it, I should find myself in a vortex of bewildering contradiction. For whilst on the one hand I should find our Admiralty assuring me that invasion was so remote a probability as to render an army of any sort an almost dispensable luxury, I should find, on the other hand, plenty of generals like yourself who would represent to me that for a Continental army the invasion of our island would be little more than the pastime of a summer's afternoon. Yet both the Admiralty view and the military view may claim professional authority.

And if, thoroughly frightened by the military view, I were to take all you generals into council, I should find no more unanimity. One of you would ask for the enforcement of the Militia Ballot as laid down in the Act of 1757; another would demand an army of four million men raised by a compulsory levy as the only way to Imperial security; whilst yet a third would regard the Territorial Army as amply sufficient, not only to deter an invader, but to carry our triumphant arms to the remotest corners of the earth.

You must pardon me, therefore, if amid all these deafening contradictions on the part of my counsellors I am unable to hear distinctly what professional opinion exactly says, and if I consequently find myself forced to let my thoughts take a bee-line of their own, guided only by such sources as seem most likely to give me the best information.

In conclusion, I feel I cannot thank you enough for your assurance that you will not impugn my patriotism for any opinions I may express which are contrary to your own. Erring sheep though you may deem me to be, you recognise that my desire for the honour, safety, and greatness of our country is no whit inferior to your own. Such recognition ought, of course, to be an elementary postulate in all discussions between friends, but unfortunately it is not, more especially where the questions at issue concern the more fundamental problems of politics. Broken windows and narrowly evaded brickbats were the price many of us had to pay not so many years ago for inability to accept the opinions of the military world as the last word of human or national wisdom. I therefore appreciate your stipulation on this point all the more, however natural it may seem to you to accord it.

The bodies comprising the Imperial Defence Committee and the Army Council, whose secret plotting is so well exposed by Mr. Farrar, are the same bodies whom Mr. Fisher and Senator Pearce had to deal with at the Imperial Conference in London during the Coronation celebrations. That they were too cunning for Australia's Labour Politicians has been amply proved by the conduct of the latter since their return. The doings of the Conference are still a secret, but Senator Pearce's Nowra speech plainly indicated that something had been done without the warrant of the Australian Parliament and behind the backs of the people.

We hope Farrar's book will be widely circulated by all anti-militarists, for in the hands of speakers and writers it will prove invaluable at the present juncture.

(The above book may be obtained from O. W. Jorgensen, price 1/3. Posted 1/5.)

The laboring man has no time to be anything but a machine.—Thoreau.

Any man will fight for a home, but nobody wants to die for a boarding house.—Ingersoll.

A Bulletin artist (Norman Lindsay) (29.8.12) pictured Australia's infant defender keeping guard over a heap of wealth amounting to £1,300,000,000. It was a fine picture, and it will cause the editor no end of trouble to explain why the Australian youngster should defend this wealth, which is mostly owned by the British, French, German, and Yankee capitalists.

The Capitalist grabs every cent in sight, and then calls upon the worker to help him to defend it.



## Racial Decay.

BY J. B.

From time to time prominent people and newspapers awake to the fact that the race in their midst is deteriorating, and in their disinterested fervour or interested circulation go to the extreme by bluntly stating that the "fit" should be prohibited from enjoying certain legal rights.

The Sydney "Sun," which is gradually acquiring a notoriety among its "reptile" contemporaries as an alarmist "yellow" publication, in a recent virtuous fit, calmly advocated the sterilisation of what it called the unfit, and quoted in support, among other authorities the discredited Dr. W. Chapple, of New Zealand.

With a sangfroid that is the supreme elevation of ignorant credulity, the "Sun" desires legislators to put into force certain measures that so far not even the most courageous and clear-sighted statesmen has been enabled to face.

But what are the unfit? According to the general opinion, the undersized, wizened, consumptive-looking person constitutes the unfit. The trouble with this generalisation is that it takes no cognisance of parentage and environment to the offspring.

The present definition would define the child of a sturdy countryman compelled through economic conditions to live and rear his children in old-world slums, and who as a result become physically and mentally atrophied, as unfit, while in all probability the offspring of naturally unhealthy parents if they happen to be wealthy is not regarded as unfit and a subject for sterilisation.

It is plain that if the conditions, the environment, befouling slums, jostling dens, tainted atmosphere, impure food, immoral and unclean surroundings were replaced by large and well-ventilated residences, modern boulevards and sanitation, wholesome food and knowledge, the problem of the "unfit" will alter in proportion as the improvements are made.

The Civic Fathers are making praiseworthy attempts to beautify the cities and incidentally sweeten the lives of its inhabitants. But what they cannot do is to solve the economic problem. So long as the majority of workers receive a mere pittance, a subsistence wage, so long will the cheap providing harpies live on their necessities. The effect of town beautification and hygiene helps to rid the worker of drink and the thousand and one befouling agencies that cloud his horizon and life. The question of bread and life is still a vital one to him, but instead of sinking into a maudlin state in an attempt to drown his sorrows, modern civics will raise him from his bestiality, and he will discern with all the poignancy of a clear vision and unclouded mind his class status and duty in society.

The preservation of the race is of more importance than its destruction, and in this respect the local governments are of more importance than all the Federal or "National" Parliaments that have ever existed or will exist. One tenement demolished, one tree planted, is of more importance as a race preservative than the mildest "democratic" form of conscription. One helps to produce healthy and sturdy growth; the other with its evil concomitants, slums, and brothels, destroy them.

Town beautification and eugenics is not the solution of the class conflict. But it goes a long way to give it a lift, for clear minds and clear discernment, the corollary of healthy constitution, will be capable of bringing about the desired social change where befuddled intellects will fail.

### CONCEPT OF VALUE.

Aristotle clearly enunciates that the money form of commodities is only the further development of the simple form of value, i.e., of the expression of the value of one commodity in some other commodity taken at random: for he says:—

5 beds equal to one house is not to be distinguished from 5 beds equal to so much money.

He further sees that the value relation which give rise to this expression makes it necessary that the house should qualitatively be made the equal of the bed, and that, without such an equalisation, these two clearly different things could not be compared with each other as commensurable quantities. "Exchange," he says, "can not take place without equality not without commensurability." Here, however, he comes to a stop, and gives up the further analysis of the form of value. It is, however, in reality, impossible, that such unlike things can be commensurable—"i.e., qualitatively equal." Such an equalisation can only be something the form of value. "It is, however, in reality, impossible that such unlike things only 'a makeshift for practical purposes.'"

Aristotle therefore himself tells us what barred the way to his further analysis: it was the absence of any concept of value. What is that equal something that common substance, which admits of the value of the beds being expressed by a house? Such a thing in truth cannot exist, says Aristotle. And why not? Compared with the beds, the house does represent something equal, in so far as it represents what is really equal, both in the beds and the house. And that is—HUMAN LABOUR.—(Marx "Capital.")

## These Socialist Fellows.

A QUESTION OF BRAINS.

Replying to a question by Mr. Arthur Henderson as to how the Socialists managed to get into the majority on the various executives of the trades unions, Lord Claud Hamilton (Chairman of the Great Eastern Railway Company), in his evidence before the Railway Commission in England, said: "Because many of these Socialists are very cunning fellows. They have considerably more brains than their fellows." Lord Claud Hamilton is also a supporter of the Anti-Socialist Union.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: You are a sympathiser with, and supporter of, the Anti-Socialist Union, I believe?

Lord Claud Hamilton: I am.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: Would you tell the Commission what induced you to give your support to the organisation?

Lord Claud Hamilton: Primarily because I conceive it to be the duty of every right-thinking person who has anything to lose to combat the insidious teachings which are being propagated by these Socialists.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: Why do you say insidious?

Lord Claud Hamilton: Because I believe with Lord Rosebery that Socialism means the end of all things.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: Never mind what Lord Rosebery said. Please give us your own reasons.

Lord Claud Hamilton: Very well. This is a degenerate age, in which people are afraid to express their opinions. But I say frankly and fearlessly that I think Socialism and all that it stands for means the triumph of the wastrel and the unfit at the expense of the workers, and the more able members of the community.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: Then the principal reason for your support is your interest in the well-being of the workers.

Lord Claud Hamilton: Exactly.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: And it is also in the interest of the workers that you oppose recognition of the unions?

Lord Claud Hamilton: It is.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: And you protest especially against the capture of the Unions by the Socialists?

Lord Claud Hamilton: I do.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: Why?

Lord Claud Hamilton: Because many of these Socialists are very cunning fellows. They have considerably more brains than their fellows.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: But you have told us that Socialism, to your mind, means the triumph of the wastrel and the unfit. How do you reconcile that with your later statement which concedes to the Socialist a brain power above that of his fellows? Do you seriously contend that these men, with their superior intelligence, are interested in the triumph of the wastrel and the unfit?

Lord Claud Hamilton: Perhaps I did not express myself as clearly as I might have done. What I meant was that they are a menace to me and the shareholding class.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: Then we are to infer that "the wastrel" and the "unfit" are terms, synonymous with "me" and "the shareholding class?"

Lord Claud Hamilton: No, you are not.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: Then will you tell us what you do mean?

Lord Claud Hamilton: I don't know, and I won't be badgered like this.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: Let me help you. You mean, perhaps, that only non-Socialist unionists should control the unions?

Lord Claud Hamilton: Yes, that is it.

Mr. Arthur Henderson: That is to say, that the less able should control those who, on your own showing, are men of superior brain power?

Lord Claud Hamilton: This is intolerable. I refuse to answer. I appeal to the chair for protection against these most impertinent questions.

The Chairman: I do not think any good purpose will be served by pursuing the examination of the witness. (To Lord Claud): I think that will do, Lord Claud. YOU HAVE TOLD US ALL YOU KNOW.

—The Co-operator.

"All exertion and struggle in human history, all aspiration and researches of science find their common aim, in the freedom of man, in the subjection of nature to the sway of the mind. Man, to be sure, is still independent on nature. Her tribulations are not yet all overcome. Culture has yet a good deal to do; aye, its work is endless. But we have so far mastered the dragon that we finally, succeeded in forging the weapon with which it can be subdued; we know the way to tame the beast into a useful domestic animal.

This salvation was neither invented nor revealed; it has grown of the accumulated labour of history. It consists in the wealth of to-day which arose glorious and dazzling in the light of science out of human flesh and blood, to save humanity. This wealth, in all its palpable reality, is the solid foundation of the hope of social democracy.—Jos. Dietzgen.

## Immortality.

An Interview with Thomas A. Edison.

By Edward Marshall, in "New York Times," (Continued.)

A man was injured at Kensington Museum, London, by an umbrella. The injury affected only the lower part of his fold of Broca. He was a highly educated man. He lost his knowledge of the English language at once, but he did not lose his knowledge of the few words of French he had learned, nor his fairly thorough knowledge of Greek—impressions recorded after his mother tongue.

Doesn't that prove that the brain is like a photographic cylinder? Why should it be immortal? It is merely a machine.

No, we are not individuals, we are aggregates, and we are aggregates made up of mighty little things. There are, for instance, 125,000,000 fibres in the nerve cord which leads from each eye to the brain.

Our matter is of very fine grain. There are many pieces of us. Or, to go back to the city simile, we are very densely populated. If you want to read a fine book, get "Brain and Personality," by Thompson.

Edison's face in repose is only a little more deeply lined than it was ten years ago, but when I asked him again about the psychic, many unsuspected wrinkles came quickly into being.

No, I don't go into study of the psychic much," he said, but the little wrinkles showed that perhaps he had given the matter more thought than his words indicated.

There is a great field there," he said, after a long pause. "A great field—for other men." Another pause. Then, as he lifted his head and looked up at the gallery which circles the vast room:

There is a great field there for other men, and that may be the next great field to be developed, by real scientists, I mean. What are we? You don't know, and I don't know. Maybe you have tried to find out. I have, certainly—tried hard. We may be mere whorls in the ether. The ether? What is it? What is in it? There is something there, but we don't know. It is a mystery—a mystery like that greatest of all mysteries—the mystery of what passes between the north and south poles of the magnet.

Are the people who are going in for psychic research accomplishing important things? He shook his head as if he very much regretted that he must give a negative reply. "I don't think these people—those who have been the subjects of most talk along those lines, at least—are the type of persons who will really find out much. They are not of the type of those who really get to the real bottom of things.

You see, the present investigators are desirous of believing. That is not the attitude of mind with which to best approach investigation of any sort. If you are anxious to believe, you are likely to believe on insufficient evidence. I know how that is myself."

I remember once when I was experimenting with certain ores I proved that. I selected at what I thought at random certain piece of ore to assay. I assayed them very carefully, intelligently, and scientifically, and they showed 20 per cent. I then took the same ore in quantities, and crushed it, and assayed it, and it showed 17 per cent.

That puzzled me. I could not understand it. So I went again to the ore heap, shut my eyes, and grabbed, taking whatever pieces of ore I happened first to touch. Proceeding thus, the ore taken from the heap assayed the same as the crushed ore. But if I took pieces while my eyes were open I always took bits which assayed high. It did not matter that I tried with all my will to be absolutely fair in my selections. I could not be so long as I kept my eyes open. I had to shut my eyes in order to get my 17 per cent.—my truly average—samples. Will power and determination to be fair and honest did not count. That's what's the matter with the psychic research people. But the field which now seems so mysterious will be explored some day, and it will yield—yield very richly. I don't know of any man today who is fitted to explore it; but the man will rise when the time is ripe, and he is ripe. Some day, somewhere in the world, will come another man like Mendeleff, and such a man will solve the mysteries."

He leaned forward in his chair and took from the top of his desk a cabinet photograph. It showed signs of frequent handling—the edges were a little worn and the corners were a little rounded. But the handling had been very careful—most respectful—that was plain. It was the picture of an old and intellectual-looking man. Down in the corner was the name of a St. Petersburg photographer. He handed it to me, keeping his eyes thoughtfully upon it as it passed.

"That's Mendeleff," said he. "See his autograph down at the bottom? I am glad I have that photograph, and that it bears the autograph."

"Mendeleff was the discoverer of the periodic system. He generalised. That's what the psychic research people must eventually do. They certainly must generalise, else they will never really accomplish much. A great generaliser will come some day whose interests will lie along those lines, and

when that man comes he will reveal much to us.

Existing experimenters seem to be working, all of them, with details. This great generaliser will not work with details, he will not call his work 'psychical research.' He will study the problem with an especially adapted intelligence and on broad lines, and he will work through the material."

He emphasised these words and then repeated them. "He will work through the material—through material things—and that man will succeed."

The things with which all scientists who really accomplish anything experiment are material things. The psychics have therefore been going at their work from the wrong end first. To solve the riddle we shall have to begin investigation at the beginning—and we don't know yet where the beginning is."

Mr. Edison was still looking at the photograph of Mendeleff. Plainly he believed the great Russian might have been the man if he had lived.

"That Russian is dead," he said slowly. "Now, where is his Will? He was a very great man. His Will was the greatest part of him. What has become of that Will? What has become of that Will?" He paused again, then shook his head again. "I don't know."

"There comes in again," I said "the question of immortality. For that Will to have entirely ceased to exist when Mendeleff's body died would indicate a loose system in nature, would it not?"

"It would seem so," Mr. Edison replied, "and yet nature's systems—nature's methods—are not loose. It's had to figure out. Perhaps matter is getting to be more progressive. That may be it. But God—the Almighty? No! And he shook his head emphatically.

Mercy, Kindness, Love. I don't see them. Nature is what we know. We do not know the gods of the religions. And Nature is not kind, or merciful, or loving. If God made me—the fabled God of the three qualities of which I spoke, mercy, kindness, love—he also made the fish I catch and eat. And where does his mercy, kindness, and love for that fish come in? No! Nature made us. Nature did it all, not the gods of the religions. And Nature did it mercilessly: she had no thought for or against mercy. She did it impersonally—what we call cruelty." Again the genius smiled his smile of whimsy. "Nature seems to be a very undesirable member of society." Then, suddenly, he looked straight at me.

"Now, I am going to ask you a question," he said abruptly. "What are you here for—here on earth I mean?"

I could not answer him. I hesitated. "I don't know," I finally replied.

He nodded, as if I had said precisely what he had expected me to say.

"Well, there you are. We do not understand; we cannot understand. We are too finite to understand. The really big things we cannot grasp as yet. Our speculations are not even creditably intelligent. They cannot be intelligent till we have developed so that we can understand things better, grasp more. We can't comprehend infinity, we can't comprehend space. We have found that out. We know it. Then—well—"

He leaned back in his chair, and for the first time in five minutes, seemed to see the things which were around him. To watch him as he talks and thinks is fascinating.

As he approaches a point in conversation he becomes astonishingly more vital, although it is not through movement that his access of vitality is evidenced—it is by the expression of his face. Sometimes as his thought grows tense, he even flushes, as a man might who was making a considerable physical effort.

I went back to the matter of psychical research, and asked him if he had been impressed by the experiments made with Eupasia Palladina, the Italian woman who convinced Lombroso that she was quite genuine as a medium, but who is said to have been proved to be an impostor in New York.

"There is nothing in such cases that would either prove or disprove the existence of life after death," he replied. "I do not deny that there may be a higher sense than those which we have at present developed, but if such a sense is now being developed it is material. I am inclined to think we are developing new senses. Animals have done it when their changing environment required it, so why should not men do it?"

Take the case of the carrier pigeon and the case of the Indian. Their lives, their safety demanded of them an actual sense of direction, a sense which would guide them with accuracy without thought, without landmarks, without maps or compass. Nature filled the want.

Put you or me out in a trackless wilderness, with nothing to direct us, and we would be quite at a loss. Do the same thing with the carrier pigeon or the Indian, and he will not hesitate, or will hesitate but for an instant before he starts on a true lane for home. This instinct did not develop in all creatures, it developed only in such creatures as had actual need of it.

To be continued.



## Open Column.

## CHURCH AND SOCIALISM.

The writer of the article on Socialism and Catholicism in last week's "International Socialist" refers to my letter disputing the contention that the Church is an enemy, and in support of that contention he gives some quotations from the encyclical of the late Pope Leo XIII. He also says that "The Pope, Cardinals, and Bishops are the Church."

Before replying to his arguments, I must say that the Pope, Cardinals, and Bishops are not the whole Church. It includes also the inferior clergy, and all who have been baptised and believe in its doctrines.

Up to the sixteenth century laymen took part in the general councils of the Church which defined its dogmas, and also in its government, and as late as the election of the present Pope Pius the X. the Emperor of Austria was able to prevent the election of Cardinal Rampolla.

As to the teaching of the Church, the writer seems to me to be under a complete misapprehension. The Catholic Church allows the fullest liberty of opinion on all questions on which a decision has not been given by a general council, or by an ex cathedra pronouncement by the Pope. There has been no such decision on the question of Economic Socialism.

The encyclical of the late Pope Leo XIII., which was addressed as much to the capitalist class as to the working class, was not ex cathedra, and consequently lay Catholics are at liberty to agree with it, or to disagree with it, according to their convictions.

As to the tremendous effect that the writer of your article says it has had throughout the Catholic world, I don't think it has had any, either on Catholic capitalists or on Catholic workers. Jim Hill, the American railway magnate, who is a Catholic, and subscribes thousands of dollars to build Catholic churches, thinks the American working class should be reduced to the standard of living of the poorest peasant of Europe. This sentiment is not in accordance with the spirit of the encyclical. In the late strike of the transport workers of the United Kingdom, the Irish Catholic workmen of Liverpool took their part, and the leaders of the Irish branch of the Transport Workers' Union, Larkin and Daly, are both Catholics, and almost all the strikers in Ireland were Catholics. Larkin has been since elected to a seat on the Dublin Corporation as an avowed Socialist. They were not much influenced by the encyclical.

I will now give some quotations from a pamphlet on Socialism, written by a Catholic priest, the Rev. E. J. Kelly, D.D., and published by the Australasian Catholic Truth Society, subsequent to the famous encyclical, although I do not agree with all that he says. I quote him merely to prove that Catholics may be Socialists, notwithstanding Papal encyclicals that are not ex cathedra. After giving a brief sketch of the history of Socialism, he says, speaking of Marx: "Marx gave to Socialism a scientific constitution, so to speak. His great work on Capital is an analysis of capital and its methods, exhaustive, erudite, philosophical, and, in the main convincing." Could any Socialist pay a higher tribute to the genius of Marx than this.

Of Marx's Theory of Value, he says: "Marx's Theory of Value is another of the main principles of modern Socialism. It is that Labour is the source of value, but that the labourer obtains for himself merely a subsistence wage, the surplus being appropriated by the exploiting capitalist. Suppose twelve men work in a mine. Suppose they produce £100 worth of wealth in a day. They get, perhaps, 5s. each for their day's labour—in all, £3. The remaining £97 all goes into the pocket of the exploiter, a sum out of all proportion to the work he puts into the production. This he calls the surplus value, a distinct from the exchange value, which the men get. The real value in actual use and fact is £100, all of which, Marx maintains, should go to the labourers by whom all the work was done. To enable the workers to get this, he would have that mine (source of wealth) seized and made collective property, peaceably if possible; if not, by a revolution."

Again in criticising the theory of socialism, he says: "In criticising it, let me say, first, that I think the religious question may well be left out. It is an economic question, unless, of course, you run full tilt against some plain violation of the natural or divine law, as when the right of private property in the present order is denied. But to condemn all forms of socialism simply because of the irreligiousness of some of its writers, is to judge it, not by its merits, but by its accidental features, by its excrescences, or by the cranks of its school. In the famous Socialist manifesto of Erfurt (1891), religion was declared to be 'a matter of private concern,' and 'ecclesiastical and religious bodies to be regarded as private associations, which order their affairs independently.' This—bear in mind—is not the irresponsible assertion of a few lawless and scatterbrained writers, but the solemn decision of the collective wisdom of the Socialist Leaders in Congress assembled. It is the charter of our religious liberties in the future regime. Besides, why do we allow these atheists to monopolise leadership in these very humane movements for the betterment of the race?"

Wiser in their own generation than the children of light, as our Divine Master declared such persons to be, they have simply torn a leaf out of the Church's policy during the Middle Ages, which was the "Golden Age" of Labour, and parade it as their own revelation: while the Catholic worker beside the Pool, is too often left to say *hominem non habet*."

As the educational question has been introduced into the controversy, I must say that a Catholic may believe in secular education without being in conflict with any authoritative teaching of his church. Cardinal Newman was in favour of allowing Catholics to enter the protestant university of Oxford to finish their education. Pope Pius IX. and Cardinal Mannes were opposed to him, and would not sanction what he proposed. The next Pope Leo XIII. agreed with Newman's view, and both allowed and encouraged Catholics to avail themselves of the advantages of Oxford.

Whenever ecclesiastical policy is against any acts or opinions that are not contrary to the moral law, it will be found upon inquiry, that such policy is not supported by the authoritative teaching of the Church, although some churchmen may try to persuade the ignorant that it is.

Huxley and Hyndman are bad witnesses to call on the question of Socialism and the Church. Huxley is reported to have said that "Children should be brought up in the current superstition, and be only told the truth as their intelligence developed." If division into sects be a sign of decay, socialism is in as bad a state as protestantism.

Hyndman's opinion on the hostility of the Church to Socialism, is of no more value than his opinion on militarism.

Facts are against the statement in your article, that the Catholic Church is gaining ground. According to the number of people of Irish and Italian birth and descent in the United States the number of Catholics should be far greater than it is. In Ireland, owing to the emigration of Catholics, the proportion of protestants to the population is greater than it ever was. The real fact is that capitalism is crushing the religious spirit out of both Catholics and protestants.

In conclusion I may add that I hold no brief for any church, but stand for the toleration of all religious beliefs, and hold that it is bad policy, as well as bad form for a party claiming to stand for the working class, to hold up to ridicule the doctrines and ceremonies of the religion of any section of that class.

E. BYRNE.

1st August, 1912.

## CHURCH AND SOCIALISM.

(By Jayem.)

"A real Socialist is a freethinker or atheist at same time," says C. L. Bushell in the "I. S.," 17/8/12. That is so, but we Socialists cannot afford to ignore our great enemy, the Church. As well ignore Capitalism or cease to agitate for the repeal of the Conspiracy Act. All students of current events (in Victoria, at any rate) note the tremendous fight of the Churches against Socialists, for theologians of all denominations recognise that when the revolution comes, the Churches, will be in the position of that mythical dragon that an equally mythical Saint George slew single-handed. The modern representative of St. George, otherwise Socialism, will have a tremendous task to destroy the Church, for its roots have a firm hold in the minds of millions of people.

In spite of the optimism of Joseph McCabe and other good Rationalists, it will be several generations before religion and superstition are erased from the minds of mankind.

If such a stupendous event as the establishment of Socialism happened within the life time of ourselves there would be still a vast amount of education needed amongst young and old alike to eradicate from the race the teachings of thousands of years of religion and superstitions which had their beginnings in dim ages ago in ignorance of astronomy and physiology. Sex worship was earlier than sun worship. In Adelaide I gave a lecture at the Socialist Party's Hall on "The History of the Cross," and traced that sex and solar emblem from the time probably of the Ice Age to our own age, a vast period of time. Think of the effect of centuries of superstition on the mental development of the present inhabitant of the world—the ages of accumulated dreams, doctrines, and theories of the first cause, which ancient peoples symbolised in the centre of our Solar system.

Astronomers, aided by the camera, the spectroscope, and the telescope, have discovered the vastness of the Cosmos and the smallness of our little Solar System. Electricity and its possibilities, medical science, geology, think of what these discover for man. Yet the Church is enslaving millions of people with its dreary superstitions and teachings of a Personal God and His Son by a human virgin mother, a doctrine preached millions of years ago. The effects of heredity and environment are great factors in the development of animals and man alike.

In face of all this, how is it possible for Socialists to ignore the mischief wrought by the teaching of the Church? I saw a printed statement by a London clergyman, that "Religion is the only bulwark against Socialism."

If the Church, as a whole, holds that opinion and belief, how is it possible for Socialists to ignore the Church and its dangers as a powerful and bitter enemy? As well sit down in a hut and ignore an oncoming bush fire.

## A.S.P. News &amp; Notes.

## National Executive.

Meeting of the A Council held at 115 Goulburn-street, August 31, 1912.

Delegates present: James, Riley (Sydney), M'Innes (Clifton), Roche, Slade (trustees), Denford (I.S. Club), Jorgenson (manager), Winspear (acting-editor and treasurer).

Com. Slade elected Chairman. Minutes of previous meeting were read and adopted.

Correspondence: Melbourne Branch wrote requesting that the financial statement be published every week, also that names and addresses of Branch Secretaries be published.

Resolved that financial statement be not published, and that Secretaries names and addresses be published when they send in reports.

Brisbane Branch wrote asking the Council to refute charges contained in a letter received from H. E. Holland.

Resolved that a reply be sent refuting the charges.

The following resolution was sent from Brisbane Branch asking that the Council ask other Branches to carry same and forward it to the American Consul at Brisbane.

"That this Branch of the Australasian Socialist Party protests against the attempted legal murder of Comrades Ettor and Giovanitti by the American Capitalist Government in connection with their efforts to lead the Lawrence strikers to victory."

Resolved that the request of Brisbane Branch be complied with.

Resolved that the accounts be paid.

## Brisbane.

Dear Comrade.—At Thursday night's meeting a resolution protesting against the attempted Legal Murder of Comrades Ettor and Giovanitti by the American Capitalist Government was carried unanimously. The opinion was expressed that the fighting methods of the I.W.W. must be driving the Capitalist in the land of the Wooden Hammer into the last ditch when they are forced to resort to such a desperate effort to crush the working class movement. Our Saturday night's meeting was very successful. Jackson was in the chair. Comrade Anderson, a veteran fighter in the cause, held the crowd splendidly with his exposure of how the worker is robbed by the exploiter. Rees followed with an excellent address upon Industrial Unionism and finished up with some convincing answers to questions asked by Labour supporters in the crowd. We sold all our papers. As we are launching out in a couple of new directions next week, I have ordered an increased supply, and I am beginning to think they will hardly be sufficient.

At our rooms this afternoon I had the lecture. The subject "The Causes of Militarism," caused a splendid discussion. Jack Munro (who received "six months hard" from a capitalistic class-conscious judge for an anti-seab speech he made during the last strike) attempted to defend the Commonwealth Government for introducing the Conspiracy Act. There were several questions which were answered from the point of view of a worker who recognises the class struggle and the fact that the military forces are the greatest weapon that the Capitalist can use against the worker. The room was crowded, our seating capacity taxed to its utmost, and there is some talk of us getting a bigger hall in a short time. Yes, we're moving some, and opening the eyes of some of the workers to the fact that there is something better and more hopeful for them to look forward to than Labour in politics. Vive the Social Revolution.

EDWARD H. BRADY,

Secretary.

Stanley-St., South Brisbane.

## Leichhardt-Annandale.

With Young in the Chair, a good meeting was held on Saturday night, when the debate arranged on the previous Saturday between Comrade Slade and Mr. Booth came off. Slade defended Socialism whilst his opponent admitted that he did not know much about it.

Next Saturday night another debate will be held between Com. Slade and Mr. Johnstone. Mr. Johnstone will defend the Labor Party's attitude and Slade will oppose.

YOUNG, Secretary.

Com. Knight has had to seek "fresh fields and pastures new." Knight was recently working for the Sydney Water and Sewerage Board, a body which has at least one of the most brutal bullies in the Commonwealth in its employment as a ganger. This fellow stands over his men and simply curses and insults them the whole time they are at work. Surely the Board can get other men than savages to act as gangers.

The lot of the worker is injurious and hard enough without having bullies hired to insult them while they are at it.

## Sydney.

Comrade Roche, Branch Secretary, and Comrade Whitmore, Assistant Secy., left us last week to seek in fresh scenes a (?) master. The good wishes of the branch members go with them. In their departure Sydney loses two hard-workers and ardent propagandists. However, we have the consolation of knowing that they are not lost to the movement, and that our branch's loss will be some other branch's gain.

All members are requested to make a special effort right now to place Sydney branch on a good firm basis financially. Once this is attained we shall be free to continue the fight with greater zest.

GORDON BROWN, Secy.

On Wednesday evening Com. James delivered a fine lecture on Historical Materialism at the Socialist Hall, Park St. The lecture was worthy of a much larger audience, but the few who came were delighted with the way Com. James handled his subject.

On Sunday, the wet weather interfered with the outdoor meetings to some extent, but at the Socialist Hall, Park-street, Com. Brown delivered an interesting and able address on the "Immorality of Socialism." Socialism, to its opponents, he said, was highly immoral, while to Socialists the present system was an immoral one. He then entered into a lengthy examination of different philosophical and theological theories and definitions of morality. At the close several questions were dealt with.

## Newtown.

Very successful meetings were held at the Newtown Bridge on Saturday and Sunday evenings. Literature sales were fair.

## Balmuir.

We had a good meeting at Rozelle on Saturday night, Com. Moore Chairman. Coms. Talbot and Bowen were the speakers. There were no drunks and we give the Chapman Mission credit for the change. Literature sold well.

Sunday night was a miserable one and our audience was small but very attentive. Moore was Chairman and Sloan speaker.

## Press and Maintenance Fund.

Already acknowledged, £20 18s 11d. Collected at Club Social 5s. 11d. C. F. Schaefer 1s. J. H. Corbet 1s. M. Brennan (Q'land) 6d. G. Lammner (W. Aus.) 10s. J. B. 2s. 6d. Total £21 19s. 10d.

## Socialist Publishing and Jobbing Plant.

Amount previously acknowledged £20 0s 6d. Received on account: G. Burgess 1s. H. E. Stone 1s. Sydney Partridge 1s. G.F.M. 2s. M. Brigand 7s. 6d. "Jayem" 10s. W. H. Hope 10s. H. Dierks 1s. Total £21 13s.

## Sydney Propaganda Fixtures.

## SATURDAY.

Rozelle—M. Moore, Sloan, Bowen, Leichhardt—Young, Knight, Walsh, Newtown—Duffield, Chambers, Bathurst-street—No meeting on account of Branch Social at 37 Park-st.

## SUNDAY.

Domion—Quinton (chair), Riley, Brown, Slade, Market-street—Green, (chair), Bowen (Balmuir Branch), Balmuir—C. Moore, Willis, Talbot, Newtown—Duffield, Walsh, Sunday Sept. 8, Socialist Hall, Park-st., Com. Jones, late of British Socialist Party, lectures. WEDNESDAY, SEP. 11.

Com. James will deliver the first of a series of lectures on Marxian Economics.

## International Socialist Club.

The Monthly General Meeting will be held on THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1912, AT 8 P.M. Business Very Important.

K. G. DRUHMEI,  
Secretary.

## Melbourne Branch

## Australasian Socialist Party,

272 Flinders Street, Melbourne.

Lectures held at above address every Sunday evening at 7.30. Meetings held also at Collingwood and South Melbourne every Friday evening. Members' Dance held every Saturday, commencing at 8 p.m.

J. R. WILSON, Secy.

## Sydney Branch.

## Australasian Socialist Party,

37 PARK STREET, SYDNEY.

Lectures are delivered at the above address every Sunday and Wednesday evening, with musical and vocal items. Commencing at 8 p.m.

On Saturday Sept. 7, the usual Monthly Social will be held, when the best available talent, under the direction of Comrade Chambers, will render a full program of songs, recitations, sketches, and dramatic selections, interspersed with dancing.

Tickets: Gents 1s. Ladies Free. Good Music. Refreshments Provided.

## JOB PRINTING.

## TRY THE MARXIAN PRESS.

115 GOULBURN STREET, SYDNEY.

For Job Printing of Every Description at Shortest Notice. Estimates Free.

Printed and published by Henry Edmund Holland, for the Australasian Socialist Party, at 115 Goulburn-street, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.